

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 20 remain pending in the present application. No claims have been amended.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. The Examiner alleges that the language of the polymeric liner is free from any radial contact with the case is not shown and described. Clearly the Examiner is misinterpreting the application as well as the drawings.

Turning to Figures 1 and 2, the seal surrounds a shaft which defines an axis. The axis of the shaft is parallel to case leg 16 in Figure 1. Case leg 14 is perpendicular to the axis of the shaft. An axial force is parallel to the axis of the shaft. Thus, a force exerted by the leg 14 is in an axial direction. A force exerted by the leg 16, against the seal 24, is in a radial direction.

The lip, as well as the liner, are not subjected to radial forces by either of the case legs 16 or 14. The case leg 14, at best, applies an axial force onto the liner in a resting position. Accordingly, the figures illustrate that the polymeric liner is free from any radial contact with the case.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not showing the above feature. Clearly the above feature is shown in the drawings and no amendment to the drawings is necessary.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner alleges that the claims are anticipated by Cather (4,504,067). The Examiner alleges that the Cather reference illustrates Applicant's invention.

The Cather casing, specifically at leg 22, applies a radial force onto the liner 14. This occurs as high pressure mounts inside the seal. The casing portion 22 exerts a force radially inward, which is perpendicular to the axis of the shaft 40. Thus, the Cather reference illustrates a radial force, applied by the casing to the polymeric liner, which is unlike Applicant's invention.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, their dependent claims are patentably distinguishable over the Cather reference.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 10 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) alleging them to be unpatentable over Cather in view of Riesing. The Examiner alleges that these combinations disclose Applicant's invention.

As mentioned above, in the Cather reference the casing applies a radial force onto the liner. Riesing, as illustrated at 46, likewise applies a radial force on the liner. Accordingly, Riesing fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Cather reference. Accordingly, the combination fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's invention. Thus, Applicant submits that Claims 5, 10 and 15 are patentably distinct over the Examiner's combination.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 1, 2005

By: 

W. R. Duke Taylor  
Reg. No. 31,306

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303  
(248) 641-1600

WRDT/jp